

*Handwritten initials and a circled mark.*

**Corinna-Bridgett** [Family: Oleson], *suae potestas esse*<sup>1</sup>,  
One of the sovereign American People living in Oregon,  
In care of: 18675 Southwest Kinnaman Road,  
Aloha (07), Oregon, United States of America  
ZIP Exempt (per USPS D.M.M., Section 122.32)

FILED 08 AUG 8 15:38 USC-ORP

**To All live Officers, Employees and Agents doing business by and through the Private  
Business Franchise (a BAR Monopoly) styled as:**

**“IN THE UNITED STATES UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON”**

conducting its business in Portland, Oregon, United States of America.

“WASHINGTON MUTUAL BANK, N. A.”, a  
foreign banking corporation, Borrower, and *ens*  
*legis* “person”,

(putative<sup>2</sup>) Plaintiff.

Vs.

“CORINNA OLESON”; and All OCCUPANTS  
of Address: 18675 SW Kinnaman Rd, Aloha, OR  
97007”, *ens legis* persons,

(putative) Defendants,

And

**Corinna-Bridgett**, *in esse*, Principal, Lender-in-  
Fact, and superior Creditor,

Third Party Intervener of Right.

Case No. CV08-0813-PK

**In Admiralty**

**Third Party Intervener’s Timely Objection  
and Motion to Deny United States  
Magistrate Judge Paul Papak’s  
“FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATION” to Remand  
Action to State Court; and Third Party  
Intervener’s Verified Affidavit in  
Support thereof**

**Demand for Common Law Trial by Jury  
(Seventh Amendment)**

**Mandatory Judicial Notice Required in Harmony with F.R.E. Rule 201(d)**

All the live officers, agents, and employees of the **private business franchise** (a BAR Monopoly)  
styled as, “IN THE UNITED STATES UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT  
OF OREGON”, are required to take mandatory judicial notice of 18 U.S.C. Sections 2, 3, 4, 241, 1341,  
1343, 1346, as well as, the Federal RICO statutes codified at 18 U.S.C. Sections 1956, 1961, 1962, 1963,  
and 1964 *et seq.*

<sup>1</sup> *suae potestas esse* – having full Power and Authority over one’s own dominions

<sup>2</sup> *putative* (adjective) - commonly put forth or accepted as true on inconclusive grounds

### **Third Party Intervener's Timely Objection to "PAPAK, Magistrate Judge: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION"**

**Comes Now:** the **Third Party Intervener of Right** and live Christian woman, **Corinna-Bridgett** [Family: Oleson], a constituent Member of the Sovereignty specifically named in the Preamble of the supreme Law of these united States of America, that is to say, the *de jure* national Constitution ratified in the Year of our Lord One-thousand-seven-hundred-ninety-one (as lawfully amended in the Year of our Lord One-thousand-eight-hundred-nineteen), *in legitiums regalis*<sup>3</sup> Character, of Private Necessity<sup>4</sup>, untrained in the Law and desiring but in want of unfettered competent assistance of counsel, as authorized Representative-in-fact for the U.S. Trust / Public Vessel and *ens legis* named party Defendant with the commercial Token Name: "CORINNA OLESON" (sic), and hereinafter "Third Party Intervener", in harmony with this limited jurisdiction court's F.R.Civ.P. Rule 24(a), appearing by Special Visitation (a "restricted appearance" within admiralty / maritime jurisdiction), and not generally; at all times relevant lawfully challenging the subject matter jurisdiction of the private commercial state "trial court" from the Beginning, and pursuant to the constitutionally required Oath of Fidelity and Oaths of Office sworn or affirmed by the presiding judge and all other attending agents of the "**OREGON STATE BAR**" (a *de facto* "public corporation" allegedly lawfully created by a special act of the Oregon legislature in A. D. 1935), acting in, by, or through the above-styled private commercial court of limited jurisdiction, *sua sponte*, hereby timely objects to "PAPAK, Magistrate Judge: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION" and moves said private commercial court of limited jurisdiction to deny said "FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION" based on the **un-rebutted material Facts** on the face of the Record testified to in the **Verified Affidavits** of the Third Party Intervener and in harmony with its F.R.Civ.P. **Rule 60(b)(3) & (4)** also moves this private commercial court of limited jurisdiction to **vacate** the void private commercial state "trial court" "SUMMARY JUDGMENT" uttered under **color of law** and **color of office** by alleged "judge pro tempore" and RICO associate-in-fact, attorney **Nancy E. Hochman**, in favor of the putative Plaintiff "WASHINGTON MUTUAL BANK, N.A." in the private commercial state "trial court" "CASE NO. C081086EV".

Additionally, in harmony with F.R.Civ.P. Rule 10(c), the Third Party Intervener incorporates herein for all lawful Purposes as if fully set forth verbatim her **Timely Objection and Motion to Strike Teresa M. Shill's Paperwork** styled as "**PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTION TO REMOVAL ACTION FROM STATE COURT AND MOTION TO REMAND**", and So-called "**DECLARATION OF TERESA**

<sup>3</sup> *in legitiums regalis* - in one's proper, *i.e.*, lawful, sovereign Character, implicitly one of *jura regalia* Capacity.

<sup>4</sup> "**law**" of Private Necessity - *illud quod alias licitum non est necessitas facit licitum, et necessitas inducit privilegium quod jure privatatur*, in English this means: That which is not otherwise permitted, Necessity allows, and Necessity makes a Privilege which supersedes the Law [see: e.g., 10 Coke's Reports 61].

M. SHILL IN SUPPORT” thereof; and, (2) Memorandum of Law with Points and Authorities in Support of her Timely Objection and Motion to Strike “PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTION TO REMOVAL ACTION FROM STATE COURT AND MOTION TO REMAND” previously filed with the district court clerk, but not yet reviewed by the federal judge assigned to this commercial Cause.

**Error # 1** @ Page 1 - F & R: “PAPAK, Magistrate Judge” incorrectly and erroneously claims that the U.S. Trust / Public Vessel and *ens legis* named party Defendant with the commercial Token Name: “CORINNA OLESON” (sic) “filed this removal action on July 7, 2008”. The face of the Record clearly testifies that the **Third Party Intervener of Right** and live Christian woman, **Corinna-Bridgett** [Family: Oleson] filed the removal action on July 7, Anno Domini 2008. “PAPAK, Magistrate Judge” appears to be attempting to prejudicially create a legal disability for the Third Party Intervener where none exists and thereby cause commercial Harm to the Third Party Intervener in the instant commercial Matter.

**Error # 2** @ Page 1 - F & R: “PAPAK, Magistrate Judge” incorrectly and erroneously claims that the *ens legis* putative “Plaintiff Washington Mutual Bank filed an objection to removal on July 11, 2008”. The face of both the Record of this private commercial franchise and the Record of the private commercial state “trial court” clearly testify that there is **no lawful written authorization** from a corporate officer authorized by the aforesaid *ens legis* putative Plaintiff’s federal corporate charter for any attorney or law firm to appear for or on behalf of the *ens legis* putative “Plaintiff Washington Mutual Bank”. Therefore, the *ens legis* putative “Plaintiff Washington Mutual Bank was **never** properly before the private commercial state “trial court” in “CASE NO. C081086EV” and **is not** properly before this private commercial court of limited jurisdiction.

**Error # 3** @ Page 2 - F & R: “PAPAK, Magistrate Judge” incorrectly and erroneously claims that “Washington Mutual purchased Oleson’s home at a foreclosure sale.” The face of **both** the Record of this private commercial court of limited jurisdiction and the Record of the private commercial state “trial court” clearly testify by the Material Facts in the un-rebutted **Verified Affidavits** of the Third Party Intervener that the live agents of the aforesaid *ens legis* putative Plaintiff initiated a sham nonjudicial foreclosure proceeding when they knew that the *ens legis* putative “Plaintiff Washington Mutual Bank” **was not** in possession of the Third Party Intervener’s **original Promissory Note**, which by operation of both domestic Contract Law and Private International Law is clearly **Fraud**.

This private commercial court of limited jurisdiction and all of its officers are required by operation of law to judicially notice the following, as it is directly applicable to the instant commercial Cause before this private commercial court of limited jurisdiction:

**“There is no question of the general doctrine that fraud vitiates the most solemn contracts, documents and even judgments.”**

“Where the unsuccessful party has been prevented from exhibiting fully his [or her] case, by fraud or deception practiced on him by his opponent, as by keeping him away from court, a false promise of a compromise; or where the defendant never had knowledge of the suit, being kept in ignorance by the acts of the plaintiff; or where an attorney fraudulently or without authority assumes to represent a party and connives at his defeat; or where the attorney regularly employed corruptly sells out his client’s interest to the other side, - these, and similar cases which show that there has never been a real contest in the trial or hearing of the case, are reasons for which a new suit maybe sustained to set aside and annul the former judgment or decree, and open the case for a new and a fair hearing. See, Wells, *Res Adjudicata*, sec. 499; Pearce v. Olney, 20 Conn., 544; *Wierich v. DeZoya*, 7Ill., (2 Gilm.) 385; *Kent v. Richards*, 3 Md. Ch., 396; *Smith v. Lowry*, 1 Johns. Ch., 320; *De Louis v. Meek*, 2 Green (Iowa), 55.”

“In all these cases and many others which have been examined, relief has been granted, on the ground that, **by some fraud practiced directly upon the party seeking relief against the judgment** or decree, that party has been prevented from presenting all of his case to the court.”

*United States v. Throckmorton*, 98 U. S. 61, 25 L. Ed. 93 (1878)

The live woman and alleged “licensed” attorney “Teresa M. Shill” continues to insult the integrity of this private commercial court of limited jurisdiction by expecting its officers to “look the other way” and not to notice that neither “ROUTH CRABTREE OLSEN, P.C.” (an artificial “person”) or Ms. Shill has the **lawful written authorization** required by law, from a corporate officer authorized by the aforesaid *ens legis* putative Plaintiff’s federal corporate charter, to act for or on behalf of “Washington Mutual Bank”.

Ms. Shill in her so-called motion to remand apparently under authority of F.R.Civ.P. Rule 12(b)(1) allegedly on behalf of the *ens legis* putative “Plaintiff Washington Mutual Bank” merely regurgitates the same off-point and irrelevant nonsense as Ms Shill foisted on the private commercial state trial “court” in collateral pleadings.

To recap un-rebutted material Facts on the face of the Record, Ms. Shill’s so-called motion to remand is a substantive and procedural nullity for the following reasons:

- I. In consideration of a 12(b)(1) motion to dismiss / remand: (1) The court must take as true the well-pleaded factual allegations of the RICO Complainant and draw all reasonable inferences in her favor, (2) Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires only that a claimant plead a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, and (3) RICO Complainant is not required to set out in detail the facts upon which he bases his claim.
- II. Ms. Shill’s so-called motion to remand contains only conclusory theories and allegations of Ms. Shill. Ms. Shill’s chimerical prattle regarding legal proceedings as Shill imagines them to be is not merely uninformative to this court, but is obviously imposed for the purposes of harassment and delay.
- III. Ms. Shill attempts to trick, deceive, and mislead this court regarding the Third Party Intervener’s RICO claim. This court is judicially noticed that the Third Party Intervener’s

RICO Complaint clearly identifies: (1) An enterprise affecting interstate commerce; (2) Two or more predicate acts in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1961, & 1962; (3) That as a result of the predicate acts, Third Party Intervener has incurred damages to a business or property interest; and, (4) If unabated, the pattern of predicate acts are likely to continue. Ms. Shill very carefully ignores the Material Fact that the Third Party Intervener's Removal Complaint satisfies the jurisdiction "prongs" necessary to maintain a Federal RICO action.

- IV. Ms. Shill's contention that the Third Party Intervener lacks standing to bring a RICO action is further evidence of Fraud on the court perpetrated by Ms. Shill as all competent jurists know and understand that a Complainant in a RICO suit has standing if claimed to be the target of **Fraud** and/or has suffered damages to a business or property Interest.

#### **Summary of Material Facts**

Whereas this private commercial court of limited jurisdiction and all of its officers have actual knowledge that the Third Party Intervener's Removal Complaint articulates a Federal RICO claim in great detail and is supported by a **Verified Affidavit**; and, whereas, this private commercial court of limited jurisdiction and all of its officers have actual knowledge that Ms. Shill's so-called motion to remand is a substantive and procedural nullity, this private commercial court of limited jurisdiction has a non-discretionary duty to deny the "FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION" of "PAPAK, Magistrate Judge" and the so-called motion to remand of "Teresa M. Shill".

This commercial Instrument is signed in full harmony with F.R.Civ.P. Rule 11.

Done and dated by my hand on this Eighth Day of the Eighth Month, in the Year of our Lord Yahushua, The Christ, Two-thousand-eight; and, of the Independence of these united States of America, the two hundred and thirty-second, under restricted signature, that is to say, with all One's constitutionally protected birthright Prerogatives, Immunities, and unalienable Rights reserved, and all Remedies preserved,



**Corinna-Bridgett, in esse,**  
Third Party Intervener of Right

## Certificate of Service

(In regard to U.S. District Court Case Number CV08-0813-PK)

The Undersigned certifies, that on the Eighth day of August, Anno Domini 2008, she served a true, correct and complete copy of the annexed: (1) **Third Party Intervener's Timely Objection and Motion to Deny United States Magistrate Judge Paul Papak's "FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION" to Remand Action to State Court;** and, (2) **Third Party Intervener's Verified Affidavit of Truth in Support** thereof; along with a (3) true copy of this **Certificate of Service** upon the named Party Plaintiff shown below, by **USPS Certified Mail** (Return Receipt Requested) at the business address set forth below, a full true copy thereof with postage prepaid to the putative Plaintiff:

WASHINGTON MUTUAL BANK, N. A.

**Attention: Kerry K. Killinger**, *in esse*, Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer

1201 Third Avenue [near: 98101]

Seattle (01), Washington

United States of America

  
Corinna-Bridgett